

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>APRIL SKOW,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:14-CV-901</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 31st day of July, 2015, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 14) of Magistrate Judge Gerald B. Cohn, recommending the court dismiss the appeal (Doc. 1) of plaintiff April Skow from the decision of the administrative law judge (“ALJ”) denying her application for disability insurance benefits, and, following an independent review of the record, the court being in full agreement with Judge Cohn that the ALJ’s decision is supported by substantial evidence, see 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (“The findings of the [Commissioner] as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.”); see also Fargnoli v. Massanari, 247 F.3d 34, 38 (3d Cir. 2001) (“Where . . . findings of fact are supported by substantial evidence, [the district court] is bound by those findings, even if [the court] would have decided the

factual inquiry differently.”), and the court noting that plaintiff filed objections<sup>1</sup> (Doc. 17) to the report, and the Commissioner of Social Security filed a response (Doc. 18), and the court finding Judge Cohn’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record, and the court further finding plaintiff’s objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by the report, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 14) of Magistrate Judge Cohn is ADOPTED.
2. The decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying April Skow’s application for disability insurance benefits is AFFIRMED.
3. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of the Commissioner and against April Skow as set forth in paragraph 2.
4. The Clerk of Court is further directed to CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>1</sup> When a party objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court performs a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. See Behar v. Pa. Dep’t of Trans., 791 F. Supp. 2d 383, 389 (M.D. Pa. 2011) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n.3 (3d Cir. 1998); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)). The court reviews the uncontested portions of the report for “clear error on the face of the record.” Cruz v. Chater, 990 F. Supp. 375, 376-78 (M.D. Pa. 1998).